REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, re-examination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.112, and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

Claim 26 has been amended in response to issues raised in the Office Action. New claims 30-32 have been added. Support for claims 30-32 may be found on page 14 of the specification. Claims 2-24 and 26-32 are now pending in this application.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 2-24 and 27-29 are allowable.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reason set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the aforementioned amendments and for at least the reasons which follow.

Revised claim 26 is now directed to a process for producing 4-hydroxy benzaldehydes by oxidizing an optionally substituted p-hydroxymandelic acid which has been produced by the process of claim 27. As such, amended claim 26 is believed to be free of any objection that the claim lacks antecedent basis for any terminology therein.

Accordingly, the §112, second paragraph rejection should be withdrawn and such action is earnestly requested.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Chemical Abstracts 57:57394, Pisano, J. et al., Clin. Chim Acta (1962), 7, 285-291; or by Chem.

Abstract 55:102382, Wybenga, D., et al, Clinica Chimica Acta (1967), 16(1) 147-54 for the reasons provided on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and for at least the following reasons.

Claim 26 has been rewritten along the lines of allowed claims 28 and 29. New claims 30-32 are directed to the oxidation of specific compounds. Claims 26 and 30-32 specify that the p-hydroxymandelic acid compound being oxidized is obtained by the process of allowed claim 27. As such, it is submitted that claims 26 and 30-32 are now allowable because they include the features of allowed claim 27 and are similar in language to allowed claims 28-29.

In view thereof, the §102(b) rejections of claim 26 should be withdrawn. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Attorney's Docket No. <u>022701-907</u> Application No. <u>09/719,839</u>

Page 16

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 838-6683 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: October 7, 2003

George F. Lesmes

Registration No. 19,995

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620